



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,004

02/14/2006

Johannes Vaananen

5054-13PUS

7890

27799

7590

02/11/2008

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

551 FIFTH AVENUE

SUITE 1210

NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER

TAKELE, MESEKER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/530,004	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAANANEN, JOHANNES	
	<b>Examiner</b> MESEKER TAKELE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-17, 19-20, and 22-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 11/13/2007.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 9, 11-17, 19, 20, and 22-23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent claims. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11-17 and 19-20 were amended. Claims 22 and 23 are added. Claims 4, 7, 10, 18 and 21 are cancelled. This action is made Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

### ***Applicant's Response***

4. Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, objection to claims 8-10, informalities previously set forth in Office Action dated 08/07/2007 are withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 15-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motosyuku et al. ("Motosyuku" US Patent No.: 5,602,566) in view of

Art Unit: 2174

Haken (US Patent No.: 7,124,374) and in further in view of Fager (US Patent No.: 6,157,368).

As to claim 1, Motosyuku, disclose a method for displaying a cursor on a display of an electronic device (Figure 3) the method comprising the steps of:

displaying only a part of a virtual view on a display of an electronic device, the virtual view comprising an entire spatially arranged data set in which a user of the electronic device navigates (col., 4, lines, 36-38 and col., 3 lines, 44-56 and);

changing the displayed part of the virtual view on the display in response to user action (col., 5, lines, 18-43 and Figure 2, 3 and 4).

displaying a cursor on the display (Figure 1, (element 107)),

determining a relation between the cursor location on the display and the location of the displayed part of the virtual view within the whole virtual view so that the cursor location on the display reflects the location of the displayed part of the virtual view in proportion to the whole virtual view (col., 4 lines, 34-53, col., 5 lines, 18-43 and col., 3 lines, 44-56),

the deviation of the cursor from a center of the displayed part of the virtual view being proportional to the deviation of the displayed part from an origin of the virtual view (col., 7 lines, 8-31 and Figure 3, 4, 5 and 6),

wherein the step of changing includes moving the cursor to a desired location and displaying another part of the virtual view on the display, another part of the virtual view corresponding to the desired location (col., 5 lines, 38-43).

Art Unit: 2174

However Motosyuku does not explicitly disclose displaying a cursor on a display. Haken from the same field of endeavor discloses a cursor (Such as, whenever the system senses that a display cursor has moved to the edge of a display in the direction of the attached device, abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Motosyuku's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Haken.

The motivation to combine allows the user to assume control of each such device by using a principal pointing device to move a cursor to the edge of the display screen in the direction of the device.

The modified Motosyuku still does not explicitly disclose deviation.

Fager from the same field of endeavor discloses the deviation (such as, the controlled object changes at a rate that is dependent on the deviation from a zero position of the position or orientation of the control member, col., 1 lines, 20-35 and col., 11 lines, 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Motosyuku's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Fager.

As to claim 2, Motosyuku discloses wherein the cursor is moved to the same direction as the virtual view is scrolled in said step of changing (col.7, lines, 8-31).

As to claim 3, Motosyuku discloses wherein the relation between the deviation of the cursor from a center of the displayed part of the virtual view and the deviation of the

Art Unit: 2174

displayed part from an origin of the virtual view is linear (col., 6 lines, 33-52, col., 7 lines, 8-31 and Figure 3, 4, 5 and 6).

As to claim 5, Motosyuku discloses wherein the step of changing also includes changing the orientation of the electronic device and changing the view on the display in response to the changed orientation (col., 4 lines, 36-52).

As to claim 6, Motosyuku discloses wherein the cursor and at least one of the displayed part of the virtual view and the virtual view have the same origin (col., 7 lines, 8-31 and).

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 6, respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 22, Motosyuku disclose wherein the relation between the deviation of the cursor from a center of the displayed part of the virtual view and the deviation of the displayed part from an origin of the virtual view is non-linear (col., 4 lines, 36-52).

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 22, respectively, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 8, 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motosyuku et al. (“Motosyuku” US Patent No.: 5,602,566) in view of Haken (US Patent No.: 7,124,374) and in further in view of Outslay et al. (“Outslay” US Patent No.: 6,937,140).

As to claim 8, Motosyuku discloses an electronic device for displaying a cursor on a display of the electronic device (Figure 3), the electronic device comprising:

- a processor (Figure 1, (element 101))

- a memory coupled to the processor, the memory comprising a virtual view suitable for conveying information to the user of the electronic device (col., 3 lines 11-25), the virtual view comprising an entire spatially arranged data set in which a user of the electronic device navigates;

- a display coupled to the processor (Figure 1);

- view control means with which the view on the display is changed (col., 5 lines, 18 – 43);

- a cursor on the display (Figure 1 (element 107)),

wherein a location of the cursor on the display and the location of the displayed part of the virtual view within the whole virtual view are related so that the cursor location on the display reflects the location of the displayed part of the virtual view in proportion to the whole virtual view (col., 5 lines, 38 – 43 and col., 4 lines, 34-53);

means for moving the cursor to a desired location and displaying another part of the virtual view corresponding to the desired location in response to movement of the cursor to the desired location (col., 7 lines, 8-31, and; and Figure 6).

However Motosyuku does not explicitly disclose displaying a cursor on a display. Haken from the same field of endeavor discloses a cursor (Such as, whenever the system senses that a display cursor has moved to the edge of a display in the direction of the attached device, abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Motosyuku's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Haken.

The motivation to combine allows the user to assume control of each such device by using a principal pointing device to move a cursor to the edge of the display screen in the direction of the device.

Further the modified Motosyuku does not explicitly disclose a browse lock being switchable between an on state and an off state, the displayed part being static when the browse lock is in the off state and being changeable when the browse lock is in the on state, the means for moving including the browse lock and the view control means.

Outsley from the same field of endeavor discloses a browse lock being switchable between an on state and an off state, the displayed part being static when the browse lock is in the



Art Unit: 2174

off state and being changeable when the browse lock is in the on state, the means for moving including the browse lock and the view control means (abstract, claim 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Motosyuku's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Outslay.

The motivation to combine provide a physical interface for interacting with the physical interface of the lock and has a display capable of displaying at least characters and of displaying a soft key operable by a user, said device being adapted to provide unlocking signals to the lock, wherein the functionality of an electronic key is provided with that of a personal digital assistant.

As to claim 9, Motosyuku discloses view control means refer to motion control means, scroll bar(s) or a mouse (Figure 3).

As to claim 11, Motosyuku disclose an electronic device is a mobile phone (col., 1 lines, 40- 44).

As to claim 12, Motosyuku disclose an electronic device is a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), remote control, gaming console, web tablet, wireless device, mobile camera or internet appliance (see col., 1 lines, 40- 44).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 13, Motosyuku disclose wherein the cursor, and the displayed part of the virtual view and the virtual view are configured to have the same origin (col., 7 lines, 8-31 and).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motosyuku et al. ("Motosyuku" US Patent No.: 5,602,566) in view of Haken (US Patent No.: 7,124,374) and Outslay et al. ("Outslay" US Patent No.: 6,937,140) and in further in view of Fager (US Patent No.: 6,157,368).

As to claim 14, Motosyuku disclose wherein the deviation of the cursor from the centre of the displayed part of the virtual view is arranged to be proportional to the deviation of the displayed part from the origin of the virtual view (col., 4 lines, 34-53, col., 5 lines, 18-43 and col., 3 lines, 44-56).

However the modified Motosyuku does not explicitly disclose deviation.

Fager from the same field of endeavor discloses the deviation (such as, the controlled object changes at a rate that is dependent on the deviation from a zero position of the position or orientation of the control member, col., 1 lines, 20-35 and col., 11 lines, 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Motosyuku's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Fager.

***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2174

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MESEKER TAKELE whose telephone number is (571)270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. T./

Examiner, Art Unit 2174

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174